Case: 4:20-cr-00144-SEP-DDN Doc. #: 21 Filed: 03/06/20 Page: 1 of 3 PageID #: 33

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of Missouri

United States of America v. ROBYN HARRISON)))	Case No.	4:20CR144SEP(DDN)
Defendant			

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

☐ Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or ☐ Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

☐ A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (previous violator): There is a rebuttable
presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person
and the community because the following conditions have been met:
·
(1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):
☐ (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C.
§ 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; or
\square (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; or
(c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the
Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); or
\Box (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs
(a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses
described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal
jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; or
\Box (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:
(i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; <i>and</i>
(2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C.
§ 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise
to Federal jurisdiction had existed; <i>and</i>
(3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was
committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; and
(4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the

defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

Case: 4:20-cr-00144-SEP-DDN Doc. #: 21 Filed: 03/06/20 Page: 2 of 3 PageID #: 34

AO 472	(Rev. 09/16)	Order of Detention Pending Trial	
			=

□ B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:
☐ (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); ☐ (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
☐ (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
☐ (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or
☐ (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.
☐ C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above
☐ The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above.
OR
☐ The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.
Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention
After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.
 hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:
 hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: □ By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. ☑ By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: □ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted Prior criminal history Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted Prior criminal history Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision History of violence or use of weapons
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted Prior criminal history Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision History of violence or use of weapons History of alcohol or substance abuse
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted Prior criminal history Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision History of violence or use of weapons History of alcohol or substance abuse Lack of stable employment
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: □ By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. ☑ By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: □ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong □ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted □ Prior criminal history □ Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision □ History of violence or use of weapons ☑ History of alcohol or substance abuse ☑ Lack of stable employment ☑ Lack of stable residence
hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven: By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required. In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following: Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted Prior criminal history Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision History of violence or use of weapons History of alcohol or substance abuse Lack of stable employment

AO 472 (Rev. 09/16) Order of Detention Pending Trial ☐ Significant family or other ties outside the United States ☐ Lack of legal status in the United States ☐ Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration ☐ Prior failure to appear in court as ordered ☐ Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement ☐ Use of alias(es) or false documents ■ Background information unknown or unverified ☐ Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION: Defendant is charged with being an accessory after-the-fact to carjacking. If convicted, she could potentially face a maximum prison term of 15 years; as such, she has a high incentive to flee. In addition, evidence presented at the hearing suggests that defendant's judgment and ability to stay abreast of court appearances may be greatly impaired as a result of ongoing drug abuse and a lack of strong familial and community ties. Specifically, proffered evidence from the government suggests that defendant was motivated to engage in the instant offense in hopes of being paid with drugs or money. Evidence proffered by the United States further suggests that, at the time of her arrest, defendant was found by police to be in the victim's car, and defendant attempted to flee from police. Although defendant appears to be a lifelong area resident, she does not appear to have strong familial or community ties. At the detention hearing, defendant indicated that, as a condition of pretrial release, she could live with her "grandmother," and she could continue working for her "grandmother" as a babysitter. However, in attempting to verify defendant's proposed home plan, Pretrial learned that defendant's "grandmother" was actually defendant's former foster mother; defendant had not lived with her foster mother since defendant was 14 years old; defendant and her former foster mother had not had face-to-face contaact for an extended period of time; and defendant's former foster mother was not comfortable allowing defendant to live with her because of defendant's history of substance abuse and defendant's associations. By defendant's admission to Pretrial Services, she is unemployed and apparently has been for some unknown period of time. Following the detention hearing, defendant had to be removed from the courtroom as she appeared to begin getting sick due to some form of drug dependence withdrawal. While there may be conditions, such as pretrial supervision, location monitoring, and drug treatment, this Court could theoretically impose, such conditions are not available in the absence of a stable home plan and/or some other form of community-based support. **Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention** The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being

held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in

Shirley P. Mensah

United States Magistrate Judge

connection with a court proceeding.

Date:

03/06/2020

Case: 4:20-cr-00144-SEP-DDN Doc. #: 21 Filed: 03/06/20 Page: 3 of 3 PageID #: 35